| 1 2 | COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP JOHN C. DWYER (136533) (dwyerjc@cooley.com) JEFFREY S. KARR (186372) (jkarr@cooley.com) | | | | | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3 | JEFFREY M. KABAN (235734) (jkaban@cooley.com) Five Palo Alto Square | | | | | |
| 4 | 3000 El Camino Real Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155 | | | | | |
| 5 | Telephone: (650) 843-5000 Facsimile: (650) 843-0663 | | | | | |
| 6 7 | Attorneys for Nominal Defendant Power Integrations, Inc. | | | | | |
| 8 | LINUTED OT A TEC DICTRICT COLUDT | | | | | |
| | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | | | |
| 9 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | | | | |
| 10 | SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | |
| 12 13 | Kimberly Quaco, Derivatively on Behalf of Nominal Defendant POWER INTEGRATIONS, INC., | Case No. C-06-2811-MHP | | | | |
| 14 | Plaintiff, | STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER | | | | |
| 15 | V. | STAYING POWER INTEGRATIONS' MOTION TO DISMISS TO ALLOW THE | | | | |
| 16 | Balu Balakrishnan, et al. | PARTIES TO FILE A MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF | | | | |
| 17 | Defendants, | SETTLEMENT | | | | |
| 18 | Power Integrations, Inc., | | | | | |
| 19 | Nominal Defendant. | | | | | |
| 20 | Pursuant to Northern District Civil | Local Rule 6-2, Nominal Defendant Pow | | | | |
| 21 | Integrations, Inc. ("Power Integrations") and Representative Plaintiffs Geoffrey Wren, Kimbe | | | | | |
| 22 | Quaco, and Christopher DeBoskey ("Plaintiffs"), by and through their respective counsel | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Pursuant to Northern District Civil Local Rule 6-2, Nominal Defendant Power Integrations, Inc. ("Power Integrations") and Representative Plaintiffs Geoffrey Wren, Kimberly Quaco, and Christopher DeBoskey ("Plaintiffs"), by and through their respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate and agree to extend the stay of Power Integrations' Motion to Dismiss to allow the parties to *finalize* a written settlement agreement and file a Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement by two weeks. Previously, the parties agreed that if they had not submitted a Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement by December 14, 2007, Power Integrations would have two weeks from December 14, 2007, to file its Motion to Dismiss and would meet and confer with plaintiff's counsel and submit a further stipulation regarding the

23

24

25

26

27

28

briefing schedule and new hearing date for such hearing. The parties need additional time to finalize the written settlement agreement and file a Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement and have agreed to extend the stay by two weeks, such that if the parties have not submitted a Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement by December 28, 2007, Power Integrations will have two weeks from such date to file its Motion to Dismiss. This stipulation is based on the following facts:

Whereas, representative plaintiff Kimberly Quaco initiated this shareholder derivative case on behalf of Nominal Defendant Power Integrations on or about April 25, 2006;

Whereas, on May 10, 2006, the parties stipulated that plaintiff would file the amended complaint on or before May 26, 2006 and that defendants would respond to such amended complaint on or before June 26, 2006;

Whereas, representative plaintiff Kimberly Quaco filed an amended complaint on May 26, 2006. At the time of filing, counsel for Power Integrations no longer represented all individual defendants. As a result, service was not completed on all defendants at the same time. By stipulation dated June 22, 2006 (and approved by the Court), the parties agreed to an effective service date and agreed that defendants would respond to the Quaco amended complaint on or before September 12, 2006;

Whereas, on August 1, 2006, after the parties had set the service and response dates by stipulation, Kathryn Champlin initiated a shareholder derivative action on behalf of Nominal Defendant Power Integrations based upon allegations that were virtually identical to those alleged in the Quaco case. Champlin also moved to be appointed lead plaintiff in the case;

Whereas, on September 5, 2006, the Court granted Power Integrations' motion to extend the time to respond to the Quaco amended complaint until after the motion to consolidate and appoint lead plaintiff was resolved;

Whereas, on December 18, 2006, the Court appointed Geoffrey Wren as lead plaintiff and the law firm of Schiffrin Barroway Topaz & Kessler, LLP as lead counsel and ordered plaintiff to file a consolidated complaint no later than January 17, 2007;

Whereas, on February 9, 2007, April 10, 2007, and May 31, 2007, pursuant to

| 1 |
|----|
| 2 |
| 3 |
| 4 |
| 5 |
| 6 |
| 7 |
| 8 |
| 9 |
| 10 |
| 11 |
| 12 |
| 13 |
| 14 |
| 15 |
| 16 |
| 17 |
| 18 |
| 19 |
| 20 |
| 21 |
| 22 |
| 23 |
| 24 |
| 25 |
| 26 |
| 27 |

stipulations by the parties, the Court extended Power Integrations' time to respond to the Consolidated Complaint and stayed all other activities to allow the parties to engage in informal discovery and to discuss a potential resolution of this matter;

Whereas, on August 3, 2007, pursuant to a stipulation by the parties, plaintiffs filed an Amended Consolidated Complaint;

Whereas, on September 11, 2007, and October 11, 2007 pursuant to stipulations by the parties, the Court extended Power Integrations' time to respond to the Amended Consolidated Complaint and stayed all other activities to allow the parties to continue to discuss a potential resolution of this matter;

Whereas, on October 4, 2007, the parties participated in a productive mediation with the Honorable Eugene Lynch (Ret.);

Whereas, since the mediation, the parties have been engaged and continue to engage in negotiations with the goal of presenting a final written settlement agreement to the Court for preliminary approval on or before November 30, 2007;

Whereas, on December 3, 2007, pursuant to a stipulation, the Court extended the stay for an additional two weeks to allow the parties to finalize and present a final written settlement agreement to the Court for preliminary approval;

Whereas, the parties are working diligently to finalize the settlement agreement but need an additional two weeks to present a final written settlement agreement to the Court for preliminary approval;

Whereas, the only scheduled events in this case are the briefing and hearing dates on nominal defendant Power Integrations' motion to dismiss the case for failure of plaintiff to comply with the shareholder demand requirement. No other scheduled dates will be affected by this stipulation.

Now, therefore, it is hereby stipulated, by and between the undersigned, as follows:

- Power Integrations response date and the corresponding briefing schedule to the Amended Consolidated Complaint are stayed;
 - 2. If the parties do not file a Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement by

28

| 1 | December 28, 2007, Power Integrations' response to the Amended Consolidated Complaint will | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | be due within two weeks of such date. If such filing becomes necessary, counsel for Power | | | | |
| 3 | Integrations will meet and confer with counsel for the plaintiffs and select a mutually agreeable | | | | |
| 4 | date for the remaining briefing schedule and hearing and submit a stipulation with such dates for | | | | |
| 5 | approval. | | | | |
| 6 | Dated: December 14, 2007 | SCHIFFRIN BARROWAY TOPAZ & KESSLER | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | | By: /s/ Lee Rudy | | | |
| 9 | | Lee Rudy | | | |
| 10 | | Counsel for Lead Plaintiffs | | | |
| 11 | Dated: December 14, 2007 | COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP | | | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | | By: /s/ Jeffrey S. Karr Jeffrey S. Karr | | | |
| 15 | | Attorneys for Nominal Defendant | | | |
| 16 | | Power Integrations, Inc. | | | |
| 17 | | <u>ORDER</u> | | | |
| 18 | PURSUANT TO THE ST | TIPULATION BY THE PARTIES, IT IS SO ORDERED. | | | |
| 19 | | DICTO | | | |
| 20 | | TATES DISTRICT CO | | | |
| 21 | Dated: December 17, 200° | | | | |
| 22 | | The Hoperstin SO ORDERED United S IT IS SO ORDERED | | | |
| 23 | | | | | |
| 24 | | Judge Marilyn H. Patel | | | |
| 25 | | THE SECOND SECON | | | |
| 26 | PHERN DISTRICT OF CREEK | | | | |
| 27 | | DISTRICT | | | |
| 28 | | | | | |

| 1 | FILER'S ATTESTATION | | | | |
|----|--|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| 2 | Pursuant to General Order No. 45, Section X, Subparagraph B, the undersigned attests tha | | | | |
| 3 | all parties have concurred in the filing of this Stipulation and [Proposed] Order. | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | Dated: | December 14, 2007 | COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP | | |
| 6 | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | | | By: | /s/ Jeffrey M. Kaban Jeffrey M. Kaban | |
| 9 | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | |